ORIGINAL Transcript of Proceedings

RECEIVED

JUN 2 5 1992

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

BEFORE THE

Federal Communications Commission

DATE: June 24, 1992

PLACE: Washington, D.C.

VOLUME: 1

PAGES: 1 - 12

Capital Hill Reporting

Official Reporters

1825 K Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 466-9500

1	BEFORE THE
2	FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
3	x
4	In the matter of: : Docket Number 92-41
5	AMORY, MISSISSIPPI :
6	x
7	The above-entitled matter came on for
8	Conference, pursuant to Notice before Walter C. Miller,
9	Administrative Law Judge, at 2000 L Street N.W.,
10	Washington, D.C., in Courtroom Number 1, on Wednesday,
11	June 24, 1992, at 8:30 a.m.
12	APPEARANCES:
13	On behalf of the Chief, Mass Media Bureau:
14	JAMES SHOOK
15	Federal Communications Commission
16	2025 M Street N.W.
17	Washington, D.C. 20554
18	
19	
20	
21	000
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(Time Noted: 8:30 a.m.)
3	JUDGE MILLER: On the record.
4	This is the date for the prehearing
5	conference in the Amory, Mississippi AM revocation
6	proceeding, MM Docket 92-41.
7	We're here today so that you can exchange the
8	written documents you intend to rely on, along with the
9	list of the witnesses you intend to present in support
10	of your direct case and we'll otherwise firm this case
11	up for hearing.
12	Before we begin, let's take some appearances.
13	For the Wayne C. Murphy?
14	(No response.)
15	JUDGE MILLER: Let the record show there was
16	no response.
17	For the Chief, Mass Media Bureau?
18	MR. SHOOK: James Shook.
19	JUDGE MILLER: All right. A prehearing order
20	was released in this case back on April 1st, 1992;
21	that's FCC 92M-414. What we'll do is we'll use that as
22	our agenda and if there's anything we don't cover that
23	way that you think we ought to cover, feel free to
24	bring it up either at the end of the session or
25	whenever we reach the appropriate paragraph in the
	CAPITAL HILL REPORTING, INC. (202) 466-9500

1	prehearing order.
2	Prehearing order, Paragraph 2, the licensee
3	was to submit a written appearance on or before April
4	27th, 1992. My records show that he did.
5	Counsel filed a notice of appearance for the
6	licensee. The firm was Gardner, Carton & Douglas. But
7	later, on June 3rd, 1992, counsel withdrew.
8	In their withdrawal notice, counsel indicated
9	that Wayne Murphy was proceeding, at that time, pro se.
10	On June 8th, 1992, FCC 92M-648, the Trial
11	Judge alerted Wayne Murphy to his future trial
12	obligations, including this conference.
13	Paragraph 3 of the prehearing order is the
14	Bill of Particulars. My records show that the Mass
15	Media Bureau served that Bill of Particulars on Wayne
16	Murphy on April 22nd, 1992. Is that correct, Mr.
17	Shook?
18	MR. SHOOK: That's what our records reflect
19	also, your Honor.
20	JUDGE MILLER: So that's been taken care of.
21	Paragraph 4 deals with the discovery end of
22	this case. My records show that you served, the Bureau
23	served a request for admissions on Mr. Murphy on May
24	7th, 1992 and that Murphy responded on May 27th, 1992.
25	Now, although you have under the terms of the

1	prehearing order, Mr. Shook, you have until July 8th to
2	complete discovery, are you in a position to tell me
3	whether you've completed your discovery?
4	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, we anticipate no
5	further discovery.
6	JUDGE MILLER: All right. My records show
7	that Mr. Murphy conducted no discovery, is that
8	correct?
9	MR. SHOOK: We're aware of none, your Honor.
10	JUDGE MILLER: All right.
11	Paragraphs 5 through 7 of the prehearing
12	order deal with exchanging exhibits and witness lists.
13	Are you prepared to exchange your written
14	exhibits today, Mr. Shook?
15	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, I have written
16	exhibits and I have a witness list.
17	JUDGE MILLER: All right. Do they comply
18	with Paragraphs 5 through 7 of the prehearing order?
19	MR. SHOOK: I believe they do, your Honor.
20	JUDGE MILLER: Are the written exhibits
21	accompanied by a sponsoring witness' affidavits where
22	they are needed?
23	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, I believe these
24	exhibits do not require a sponsoring witness.
25	JUDGE MILLER: All right. Keeping two copies

1	to give to the Court Reporter at the upcoming
2	evidentiary admission session, if there is one, proceed
3	with your exchange.
4	You cannot as you know, you cannot give
5	two copies to Mr. Murphy, who is not here, but you can
6	at least give two copies to the Presiding Officer and I
7	think it might be wise if you took advantage of that
8	mailing address that Gardner, Carton & Douglas and send
9	him two copies. I mean send him a copy of your list
10	and the exhibits, okay?
11	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, I'll send him a copy
12	today.
13	JUDGE MILLER: All right.
14	All right, the exchange has been made. I
15	guess I only need one copy.
16	MR. SHOOK: That's fine, your Honor.
17	(Whereupon, a woman entered the Courtroom and
18	handed a telegram to Judge Miller.)
19	JUDGE MILLER: I have received a telegram,
20	Mr. Shook. I think we better read this into the
21	record. It's addressed to me as Administrative Law
22	Judge, Federal Communications Commission, urgent,
23	delivery by 8:15 a.m. on June 24th and deliver it to
24	2000 L Street, Room 213.
25	And it reads: "In the matter re: WDAT Docket

1 MM 92-41 prehearing conference scheduled today,
2 respectfully request continuation. Inches from
3 finalizing sale to local minority businessman. Expect
4 transfer under minority distress sale policy. Please,
5 Wayne C. Murphy, Licensee."

Unfortunately, we already started with the conference and we're going to complete the conference. I will arrange to send the man a message, but I think we ought to mention two, at least from the Bench's view, two items and then if you have anything that you want to add about this message, you can, Mr. Shook.

They had indicated once before that they were very close to a distress sale and that's back when they had counsel and they indicated that they thought they might be able to -- in fact I think it's in writing somewhere -- and I have indicated that ordinarily I'm very receptive to a minority distress sale.

It's Commission policy and I try to follow it and I have, but I am not that interested in this proceeding in a distress sale implementation and I'll put on the record why.

Amory, Mississippi, the facility in question is a 500 watt daytime only facility in an area that is economically hurting. I'm aware of that from a previous case that I had down in Ripley and Calhoun.

1	The 500 watt daytime station in Amory would be
2	competing against two other existing broadcasters.
3	Each of those two other existing broadcasters
4	have both an AM and an FM, so that the competition for
5	advertising revenues is loaded heavily against whoever
6	that licensee, the license of that 500 watt daytime
7	only would be and I think it would be doing an
8	injustice to some unsuspecting minority to sell him
9	such a facility.
10	As a consequence, I can't display the empathy
11	to this telegram that I might under different
12	circumstances.
13	Mr. Shook?
14	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, should Mr. Murphy and
15	this unknown perspective buyer actually submit a
16	distress sale application, we would thoroughly review
17	it at that time. Until such an application is actually
18	submitted, we have no way of knowing, you know, how
19	this should play out.
20	For all we know, Mr. Murphy may be selling
21	this station for an absolute song to this person and
22	this person may have reasons other than economic gain
23	for actually wanting to purchase it.
24	So insofar as whether it may meet the
25	distress sale requirements, we simply have to wait to

1	see what's submitted.
2	JUDGE MILLER: Well, in past cases, I have
3	required the licensee who wanted to go the distress
4	sale route to file a pleading with me saying yes, we
5	are going to implement and not be inches away from
6	finalizing.
7	I mean, we are going to implement the
8	distress sale policy. The Bureau gets a chance to
9	comment on that and I generally then put the hearing
10	off for 90 days.
11	MR. SHOOK: This may be something your Honor
12	may wish to consider then in an order, you know,
13	following this conference so Mr. Murphy is alerted
14	exactly to what your Honor wants.
15	JUDGE MILLER: Well, I alerted Gardner,
16	Carton & Douglas and told them. I said now, if you
17	want to go distress sale, you know how to do it.
18	MR. SHOOK: We have no way of knowing how
19	well or how poorly they may have communicated with Mr.
20	Murphy.
21	JUDGE MILLER: I know, I am aware of that.
22	But in any event, Mr. Murphy's position as set out in
23	the Western Union telegram, has been placed on this
24	record and I will get some sort of communication to him
25	that we are proceeding and we intend to continue to

1	proceed.
2	MR. SHOOK: With respect to that, your Honor,
3	I would request that the dates that you have
4	established will be maintained, absent a firm proposal
5	that meet's your Honor's requirements.
6	JUDGE MILLER: That's correct, that's
7	correct.
8	In fact, Paragraph 8 of the prehearing order
9	sets up the evidentiary admission session for July 2nd,
10	1992 at 8:30 a.m. and only you, since you're the only
11	one that's exchanged exhibits, will formally identify
12	and offer these materials into evidence and it's up to
13	Mr. Murphy, if he has any objections or if he wants to
14	dispute anything that's in those two exhibits, he
15	should be here and do so and I'm going to let him know
16	that.
17 .	And, at the conclusion of that evidentiary
18	admission session, I'll also point out to him that he's
19	been called as a witness, an adverse witness, by the
20	Bureau and it will be up to him to be here.
21	And I'll also point out to him in a
22	communication that if he is serious about the distress
23	sale policy, he better follow proper procedures and let
24	you people know.
25	Paragraph 0 of the prehearing order deals

with the hearing date. The hearing date is July 27th, 1992 and will remain that, unless and until we get a proper pleading before us that we believe is a sincere effort to go the distress sale route.

It may be that -- in the event that we do not go to hearing in this case, we are still faced with another problem. Assuming Mr. Murphy's license is revoked or he turns it in or whatever and it goes back to the processing line for an analysis to open up for other people to apply for it, I would be perfectly willing, although I know this is not directly connected with this case, be perfectly willing to recommend to the processing line that they do one of two things.

One, conduct an engineering investigation to find out if this could be used full time and with more than 500 watts power, so that what we end up opening up as something that may have a chance of making it financially.

Or and at least to my knowledge they've never done this, conduct an investigation to find out if there's an available FM channel you can put in Amory and then offer it both an FM and an AM, so that the person who got it was getting -- yes, he's getting a daytime only AM, but he's also getting a full time FM and therefore, could be competitive with the other

1	stations. Whoever gets it, would be competitive with
2	the other stations that are located there.
3	Now, that to my knowledge, has not been done,
4	but I think with a little ingenuity they wouldn't have
5	any problem doing it if they wanted to.
6	MR. SHOOK: Who knows in this area, your
7	Honor, a little creativity may go a long way.
8	JUDGE MILLER: Well, especially when we have
9	a daytime only problem on our hands.
10	In the event that Mr. Murphy does not, A, get
11	the train stopped by the time of the evidentiary
12	admission session and doesn't show up to contest your
13	induction of exhibits, I may call on you to file a
14	motion for summary decision, rather than wait for the
15	July 27th hearing, if there is nothing really to be
16	heard.
17	And if I do that, I'll probably be asking you
18	to file sometime in early to mid July, so that we can
19	get the days running and give him a chance to respond
20	and get this case off the books if we need to.
21	MR. SHOOK: I anticipated as much. I think
22	the rules would ask for or require that such a motion
23	generally be filed no less than 20 days before the
24	start of the hearing.
25	JUDGE MILLER: Right.

1	MR. SHOOK: So I anticipated a relatively
2	short turnaround between the admission session and the
3	filing of such a motion.
4	JUDGE MILLER: Right. Now, the admission
5	session is July 2nd, isn't it?
6	MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir.
7	JUDGE MILLER: I mean it's not an earth
8	shaking arduous task to prepare this motion for summary
9	decision in the event it continues along the lines it
10	has.
11	MR. SHOOK: I hope not.
12	JUDGE MILLER: Well, a lot of it will just be
13	repeating what you have already exchanged today.
14	Well, with that is there anything further we
15	need to take up today, Mr. Shook?
16	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, nothing.
17	JUDGE MILLER: Okay, then we stand adjourned
18	until July 2nd, 1992 when we will hold the evidentiary
19	admission session.
20	MR. SHOOK: Thank you, your Honor.
21	(Whereupon, at 8:50 o'clock a.m., the
22	conference in the above entitled matter was concluded.)
23	
24	000
25	

CERTIFICATE

This is to co	ertify that the attached proceedings
before the FEDERAL	COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
in the matter of:	AMORY, MISSISSIPPI
Docket Number:_	92-41
Place:_	Washington, D.C.
Data.	June 24. 1992

were held as herein appears, and that this is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

CAPITAL HILL REPORTING, INC.

Y for

EDNA SEGAL-Official Reporter